

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP
SHAWN A. WILLIAMS (213113)
JOHN H. GEORGE (292332)
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)
shawnw@rgrdlaw.com
jgeorge@rgrdlaw.com
- and -
PAUL J. GELLER (*pro hac vice*)
STUART A. DAVIDSON (*pro hac vice*)
CHRISTOPHER C. GOLD (*pro hac vice*)
120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
Boca Raton, FL 33432
Telephone: 561/750-3000
561/750-3364 (fax)
pgeller@rgrdlaw.com
sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com
cgold@rgrdlaw.com

LABATON SUCHAROW LLP
JOEL H. BERNSTEIN (*pro hac vice*)
CORBAN S. RHODES (*pro hac vice*)
140 Broadway
New York, NY 10005
Telephone: 212/907-0700
212/818-0477 (fax)
jbernstein@labaton.com
crhodes@labaton.com

EDELSON PC
JAY EDELSON (*pro hac vice*)
RAFEY BALABANIAN (*pro hac vice*)
350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: 312/589-6370
312/589-6378 (fax)
jedelson@edelson.com
rbalabanian@edelson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In re FACEBOOK BIOMETRIC
INFORMATION PRIVACY LITIGATION

) Master File No. 3:15-cv-03747-JD
) CLASS ACTION

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS.

) PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND
) MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY
) OF DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED EXPERT
) MATTHEW TURK, PH.D.;
) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
) AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF

DATE: May 17, 2018
TIME: 10:00 a.m.
CTRM: 11, 19th Floor
JUDGE: Hon. James Donato

[REDACTED]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARDS	3
III. ARGUMENT	4
A. Dr. Turk's Opinions Are Not Helpful or Relevant Because [REDACTED], a Position Contrary to BIPA and Rejected by the Court.....	4
B. Dr. Turk's Testimony Should be Excluded Because It Ignores Directly Contrary Evidence	6
C. Dr. Turk's Opinions Should Be Excluded Because [REDACTED]	8
D. The Court Should Exclude Dr. Turk's Testimony Regarding the Detection and Alignment Phases of Facebook's Face Recognition System Because They Are Entirely Unfounded	10
E. Dr. Turk's Opinions Regarding [REDACTED] Should Be Excluded Because [REDACTED]	12
F. The Court Should Exclude Dr. Turk's Opinion Regarding Disabling Facebook's Recognition System Because It Is Based on No Analysis	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Abarca v. Franklin Cty. Water Dist.</i> , 761 F. Supp. 2d 1007 (E.D. Cal. 2011).....	6, 8
<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90877 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2012).....	6
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	3, 4
<i>EMC Corp. v. Pure Storage, Inc.</i> , 154 F. Supp. 3d 81 (D. Del. 2016).....	10
<i>Freeny v. Murphy Oil Corp.</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118736 (E.D. Tex. June 3, 2015).....	10
<i>Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21413 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015)	11
<i>In re Rezulin Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 369 F. Supp. 2d 398 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....	6, 7
<i>Jack Henry & Assocs. v. BSC, Inc.</i> , 487 F. App'x 246 (6th Cir. 2012)	11
<i>Johnson v. Mead Johnson & Co., LLC</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195104 (D. Minn. Aug. 13, 2012)	8
<i>Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael</i> , 526 U.S. 137 (1999).....	3
<i>Lauzon v. Senco Prods.</i> , 270 F.3d 681 (8th Cir. 2001)	3
<i>Lust By & Through Lust v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.</i> , 89 F.3d 594 (9th Cir. 1996)	3
<i>Mullins v. Premier Nutrition Corp.</i> , 178 F. Supp. 3d 867 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	12
<i>Newkirk v. Conagra Foods, Inc.</i> , 727 F. Supp. 2d 1006 (E.D. Wash. 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 438 F. App'x 607 (9th Cir. 2011).....	13

1		
2		Page
3		
4	<i>Nichols v. Am. Nat'l Ins. Co.</i> ,	
5	154 F.3d 875 (8th Cir. 1998)	3
6	<i>Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.</i> ,	
7	2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8783 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2015)	11, 13
8	<i>Primiano v. Cook</i> ,	
9	598 F.3d 558 (9th Cir. 2010)	4, 5
10	<i>SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC</i> ,	
11	397 F.3d 733 (9th Cir. 2005)	6
12	<i>United Food & Commercial Workers Local 1776 v. Teikoku Pharma USA</i> ,	
13	2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182940 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2017)	3, 6, 13
14	<i>United States v. Gonzalez-Maldonado</i> ,	
15	115 F.3d 9 (2009)	4
16	<i>United States v. Redlightning</i> ,	
17	624 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 2010)	3
18	STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS	
19	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	
20	Rule 26	8, 9
21	Rule 26(a)(2)(B)(ii)	6, 8
22	Federal Rules of Evidence	
23	Rule 401	1
24	Rule 403	1, 4
25	Rule 702	1, 3, 4
26	Rule 702(a)	5, 13
27	Rule 26(a)(2)(B)(i)	11
28		

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO: ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on May 17, 2018 at 10:00 a.m., before the Honorable James Donato, United States District Judge, at the United States District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Courtroom 11, 19th Floor, San Francisco, California 94102, plaintiffs Adam Pezen, Nimesh Patel, and Carlo Licata will move this Court for an order, pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 403 and 702 on the grounds that Dr. Matthew Turk's ("Dr. Turk") opinions are unreliable, would serve to mislead and confuse the jury, and will not assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or determine a fact at issue. This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof, the Declaration of Shawn A. Williams and the [Proposed] Order filed herewith, all pleadings and papers filed herein, arguments of counsel, and any other matters properly before the Court.

ISSUE TO BE DECIDED

Whether Dr. Turk should be excluded from testifying at trial under the Federal Rules of Evidence, including Rules 401, 403 and 702.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly desperate effort to escape compelling evidence of liability, including admissions that Facebook's facial recognition system scans face geometry in photos uploaded to its platform, thereby collecting biometric identifiers, Facebook disclosed the report of Dr. Turk, who

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The unreliability of Dr. Turk's report is not limited to his convenient avoidance of directly contrary evidence from Facebook itself, including Facebook's clear admissions in numerous pre-litigation documents explaining, for example, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]¹ Ex. 2 at 2. Dr. Turk's entire analysis appears to be [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 Compare ECF No. 120 ("MTD Order") at 21-22 with Ex. 3, ¶3.³ [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 Separately, Dr. Turk's opinions rely in part on [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED], a Facebook software engineer and research scientist, who co-founded and sold

9 Face.com to Facebook. *See id.* at B-1. Dr. Turk testified that [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] *See* Ex. 4 at 63:10-19; 78:11-16. Apart from the

11 circular and curious nature of an expert opinion being confirmed by the defendant, Dr. Turk

12 produced no useful information about [REDACTED] and plaintiffs were therefore unable to

13 effectively cross-examine Dr. Turk regarding their influence on his opinions. Indeed, Dr. Turk

14 [REDACTED]

15 *id.* at 62:19-63:19. Dr. Turk did produce [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED] *Id.* This absolute failure to provide the underlying material on which his opinions

18 are based also warrants exclusion of Dr. Turk's testimony.

19 Finally, the Court should exclude Dr. Turk's conclusory, baseless and unscientific opinions

20 that [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] ¶¶114, 118-121, 128. Not one of

23 these opinions is based on any actual analysis or methodology that can be tested; and, as Dr. Turk

24 [REDACTED]

25 ¹ All "Ex. _" references herein are to the Declaration of Shawn A. Williams in Support of
26 Plaintiffs' Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Defendant's Proposed Expert Matthew Turk Ph.D.,
filed concurrently herewith.

27 ² Biometric Information Privacy Act, 740 ILCS 14/1, *et seq.*

28 ³ [REDACTED]

1 readily admitted, [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED]

4 As detailed further below, the Court should exclude all of Dr. Turk's proposed testimony as it
5 unreliable and will do nothing to assist the jury in assessing the actual issues in dispute.

6 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS**

7 Trial courts must perform a "gatekeeping function" to ensure expert testimony satisfies the
8 "reliable and relevant" prongs of Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. *United States v.*
9 *Redlightning*, 624 F.3d 1090, 1111 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*,
10 509 U.S. 579, 589 (1993) (expert testimony must be "not only relevant, but reliable"). The party
11 proffering the expert has the burden of proving – by a preponderance of the evidence – that the
12 expert's testimony is admissible under Rule 702. *United Food & Commercial Workers Local 1776*
13 *v. Teikoku Pharma USA*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182940, at *98 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2017) (citing
14 *Lust By & Through Lust v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.*, 89 F.3d 594, 598 (9th Cir. 1996)).

15 Rule 702 and *Daubert* apply "not only to testimony based on 'scientific' knowledge, but also
16 to testimony based on 'technical' and 'other specialized' knowledge." *Kumho Tire Co. v.*
17 *Carmichael*, 526 U.S. 137, 141, 147-48 (1999).⁴ Expert opinion testimony is appropriate only where
18 the trier of fact would not ordinarily be able to resolve a factual issue without technical or
19 specialized assistance. *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 591; *Kumho Tire*, 526 U.S. at 156. *Lauzon v. Senco*
20 *Prods.*, 270 F.3d 681, 686 (8th Cir. 2001) ("[E]vidence based on scientific, technical, or other
21 specialized knowledge must be useful to the finder of fact in deciding the ultimate issue of fact. . . .
22 This is the basic rule of relevancy.").

23 If a jury is capable of drawing its own inferences from the available evidence, expert
24 testimony is not "helpful to the trier of fact." *Nichols v. Am. Nat'l Ins. Co.*, 154 F.3d 875, 883 (8th
25 Cir. 1998). In fact, such opinion testimony can result in unfair prejudice to the opposing party by
26 confusing the issues or misleading the jury. *See United States v. Gonzalez-Maldonado*, 115 F.3d 9,

27
28 ⁴ All citations and footnotes omitted and emphasis added, unless otherwise indicated.

1 17-18 (2009) (“By appearing to put the expert’s stamp of approval on [a] theory, such testimony
2 might unduly influence the jury’s own assessment of the inference that is being urged.”).

3 “Rule 702 sets forth the overarching requirement of reliability, and an analysis of the
4 sufficiency of the expert’s basis cannot be divorced from the ultimate reliability of the expert’s
5 opinion.” Fed. R. Evid. 702 advisory committee notes to 2000 amendments. An expert opinion is
6 reliable “if the knowledge underlying it has a reliable basis in the knowledge and experience of the
7 relevant discipline.” *Primiano v. Cook*, 598 F.3d 558, 565 (9th Cir. 2010). The trial court must
8 consider whether the testimony: (1) is “based on sufficient facts or data”; (2) is “the product of
9 reliable principles and methods”; and (3) applies “the principles and methods to the facts of the
10 case.” Fed. R. Evid. 702. The knowledge underlying the expert’s opinion must also have a valid
11 connection to the pertinent inquiry. *Primiano*, 598 F.3d at 565.

12 Courts should exclude an expert’s proffered testimony under Federal Rule of Evidence 403 if
13 its “probative value is substantially outweighed by a danger of one or more of the following: unfair
14 prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, undue delay, wasting time, or needlessly
15 presenting cumulative evidence.” *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403. “Expert evidence can be both powerful
16 and quite misleading because of the difficulty in evaluating it. Because of this risk, the judge in
17 weighing possible prejudice against probative force under Rule 403 of the present rules exercises
18 more control over experts than over lay witnesses.” *Daubert*, 509 U.S. at 595.

19 **III. ARGUMENT**

20 **A. Dr. Turk’s Opinions Are Not Helpful or Relevant Because [REDACTED] 21 [REDACTED] a Position Contrary to 22 BIPA and Rejected by the Court**

23 In the MTD Order, the Court rejected Facebook’s argument that BIPA’s definition of “scan”
24 is limited to in-person scans:

25 Facebook argues that the only way to reconcile the statute’s inclusion of
26 “scan” and exclusion of “photographs” is to read the word “scan” to mean *in-person*
27 scan. But this cramped interpretation is not stated in BIPA and cannot be squared
28 with the statute’s purpose.

MTD Order at 21-22. The Court explained that BIPA is an informed-consent privacy law
specifically addressing the collection and use of personal biometric identifiers at a time when

1 biometric technology was beginning to be widely deployed and “to cabin this purpose within a
 2 specific in-person data collection technique has no support in the words and structure of the statute,
 3 and is antithetical to its broad purpose of protecting privacy in the face of emerging biometric
 4 technology.” *Id.* [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 For example, immediately after describing his assignment, [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] According
 11 to Dr. Turk, [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED] ¶39. In fact, Dr. Turk’s main conclusion is [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] Thus, Dr. Turk’s entire
 17 opinion regarding [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 Dr. Turk’s conclusion that [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]’ because Dr. Turk is [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] *Primiano*, 598 F.3d
 23 at 565. Thus, even if Dr. Turk’s opinion [REDACTED]

24 [REDACTED]

25 [REDACTED] Fed. R. Evid. 702(a) (requiring that the expert’s knowledge assist the trier of fact “to
 26 determine *a fact in issue*”). Accordingly, Dr. Turk’s opinions [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED] should be excluded. *Teikoku Pharma*, 2017

28 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182940, at *117 (excluding expert opinion on topics irrelevant to elements of

antitrust claims); *Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90877, at *31 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2012) (excluding expert opinions that are “contrary to law” and therefore not helpful to the jury). His opinions are also wholly irrelevant to the Court’s interpretation of BIPA. *See SEC v. Capital Consultants, LLC*, 397 F.3d 733, 749 (9th Cir. 2005) (“Experts may interpret and analyze factual evidence but may not testify about the law.”).

B. Dr. Turk’s Testimony Should be Excluded Because It Ignores Directly Contrary Evidence

Expert opinion is unreliable if the expert fails to consider contrary evidence and instead cherry-picks his support. *In re Rezulin Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 369 F. Supp. 2d 398, 425 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).⁵ Further, “if the relevant scientific literature contains evidence tending to refute the expert’s theory and the expert does not acknowledge or account for that evidence, the expert’s opinion is unreliable.” *Id.*; *see also Abarca v. Franklin Cty. Water Dist.*, 761 F. Supp. 2d 1007, 1066 n.60 (E.D. Cal. 2011) (“A scientist might well pick data from many different sources to serve as circumstantial evidence for a particular hypothesis, but a reliable expert would not ignore contrary data.”).

Here, Dr. Turk concludes that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] extraterritoriality summary judgment motion (ECF No. 257). The DeepFace paper is the most comprehensive literature describing how Facebook’s current facial recognition system works. *See Ex. 5.*⁶ Importantly, in his report, Dr. Turk

⁵ Plaintiffs presume that as required by Rule 26(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Dr. Turk included in his report all facts and data considered by the witness in forming his opinion.

⁶ Even worse, [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED] As
 4 the DeepFace paper makes abundantly clear, processing human facial features in different places is
 5 exactly how Facebook's system operates:

6 These layers [of the deep neural network comprising the representation phase] are
 7 able to capture correlations between *features* captured in *distant parts* of the face
 images, *e.g., position and shape of eyes and position and shape of mouth.*

8 Ex. 5 at FBBIPA_00001217. Dr. Turk [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] *Rezulin*, 369 F. Supp. 2d at 425.

16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]
 26 [REDACTED]

27 ⁷ Nowhere in the DeepFace paper does [REDACTED]
 28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED] *Abarca*, 761 F. Supp. 2d at 1066 n.60.

9 **C. Dr. Turk's Opinions Should Be Excluded Because They [REDACTED]**

10 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B)(ii) requires an expert to disclose "the facts or
 11 data considered by the witness in forming" his opinions. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B)(ii). The
 12 purpose of this Rule is to provide the opposing party a "reasonable opportunity to prepare for
 13 effective cross examination and perhaps arrange for expert testimony from other witnesses." Fed. R.
 14 Civ. P. 26 (advisory committee notes to 1993 amendment). Without the information and materials
 15 considered by an expert in forming his opinions, the opposing party is deprived of the opportunity on
 16 effectively cross-examining the expert. *Id.*; see also *Johnson v. Mead Johnson & Co., LLC*, 2012
 17 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 195104, at *10-*11 (D. Minn. Aug. 13, 2012) ("useful cross examination and
 18 possible impeachment can only be accomplished by gaining access to all of the information that
 19 shaped or potentially influenced the expert witness's opinion").

20 In his December 22, 2017 report, disclosed over a month after the fact discovery cut-off,
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]

23 [REDACTED] Because the report was silent on the substance of the
 24 conversations and neither Dr. Turk nor Facebook provided any documents memorializing the
 25 conversations, on February 14, 2018, plaintiffs wrote to Facebook demanding any notes, transcripts
 26 or recording of the conversations pursuant to Rule 26. Ex. 8. In response, on February 26, 2018,
 27 Facebook [REDACTED]
 28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 In his deposition, [REDACTED]
4 [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED]
19 [REDACTED]
20 [REDACTED]
21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED] See
25 *Freeny v. Murphy Oil Corp.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118736, at *5-6 (E.D. Tex. June 3, 2015)
26 [REDACTED]
27 ⁸ [REDACTED]
28 [REDACTED]

(excluding expert report to the extent that it relied on conversations with witness where plaintiff was prevented from taking discovery on conversations from witness before fact discovery cutoff).

Because there is no way for plaintiffs to reasonably inquire into [REDACTED] the Court should entirely exclude his testimony. *See Freeny*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118736 at *5-*6 (E.D. Tex. June 4, 2015); *compare EMC Corp. v. Pure Storage, Inc.*, 154 F. Supp. 3d 81, 116 (D. Del. 2016) (allowing opinions where expert disclosed “the substance of the discussions in enough detail to permit [plaintiff] to conduct meaningful cross examination and other discovery”).

D. The Court Should Exclude Dr. Turk’s Testimony Regarding [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Because They Are Entirely Unfounded

As an afterthought to his unreliable opinions [REDACTED]

The entirety of the “analysis” for this conclusion comprises five sentences and includes no evidentiary or literary support. *See* ¶¶115-116. Also missing is any basis or reasoning as required by Rule 26(a)(2)(B)(i) behind how Dr. Turk arrived at his conclusions. *Id.* For example, the whole analysis supporting the conclusion that [REDACTED]

¶115.⁹ [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] ¶116. Again, no support is
 provided and no attempt is made to explain how or w [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] The absence of
 meaningful analysis alone is enough to warrant excluding Dr. Turk's opinions regarding [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] See *Open Text S.A. v. Box, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8783, at
 *20-*21 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2015) (excluding testimony where the "link, if any, between" the
 documents considered and the expert's conclusions were "written in invisible ink").

But Dr. Turk's conclusions regarding [REDACTED] reveal a further
 flaw in his analysis – he fails [REDACTED] and only refers to it in exclusionary terms.
 Throughout the report, Dr. Turk only mentions [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] This is particularly
 true in his "analysis" of [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] By not explaining [REDACTED] his
 opinions are based on, Dr. Turk offers no assistance to a trier of fact. See *Jack Henry & Assocs. v.*
BSC, Inc., 487 F. App'x 246, 256 (6th Cir. 2012) (affirming exclusion of expert testimony where
 expert failed to define key term in report). Without a definition [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED], or
 to meaningfully cross-examine Dr. Turk on those questions. Dr. Turk's deposition, [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] his conclusions do not assist a trier of fact seeking to

⁹ [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] See *Fujifilm Corp. v. Motorola Mobility LLC*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
 21413, at *87 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 20, 2015) ("Where expert testimony 'simply rehash[es] otherwise
 admissible evidence about which [the expert] has no personal knowledge, such evidence – taken on
 its own – is inadmissible.'") (alterations in original);
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 **E. Dr. Turk's Opinions Regarding [REDACTED]**
 8 **Theft Should Be Excluded Because [REDACTED]**

9 By his own admission, [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] *See Mullins v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, 178 F. Supp. 3d 867, 901
 17 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (excluding orthopedic professor's testimony regarding effectiveness of dietary
 18 supplement).

19 Moreover, whether a person's identity can or cannot be stolen from Facebook using its face
 20 recognition technology is not an element of liability under BIPA and therefore is not an issue in
 21 dispute. Plaintiffs need not prove anything regarding identity theft to establish a violation of BIPA,
 22 and there is no defense available to Facebook involving a lack of identity theft. *See* 740 ILCS 14/15.

23 A [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED] Fed. R. Evid. 702(a) (to be
 25 admissible, expert must assist the trier of fact "to determine *a fact in issue*"); *Teikoku Pharma*, 2017
 26 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 182940, at *117.

27 Finally, Dr. Turk's opinion is self-contradictory. [REDACTED]
 28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED] Given this striking contradiction, [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED] there is no question that Dr. Turk's testimony on the
 5 topic will only serve to confuse the jury and offer no relevant assistance. *See Newkirk v. Conagra*
 6 *Foods, Inc.*, 727 F. Supp. 2d 1006, 1027 (E.D. Wash. 2010) (excluding expert opinion that was
 7 contradicted by studies relied on in report), *aff'd*, 438 F. App'x 607 (9th Cir. 2011).

8 **F. The Court Should Exclude Dr. Turk's Opinion [REDACTED]**
 9 **[REDACTED] Because It Is Based on No Analysis**

10 Dr. Turk's opinion re [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]

13 This, of course, is entirely insufficient and should be excluded. *See Open Text*, 2015 U.S. Dist.
 14 LEXIS 8783, at *20-*21.

15 Moreover, Dr. Turk's opinion is wrong and deeply misleading because Facebook has, in fact,
 16 turned off its facial recognition system for all European users. Exs. 10-11. If, as Dr. Turk posits, [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED] Finally, as with several other opinions,
 19 [REDACTED] but they
 20 have nothing to do with the actual issues in dispute in this case and will not assist the jury.
 21 Therefore, they should be excluded.

22
 23
 24
 25
 26 ¹⁰ Dr. Turk's deposition testimony [REDACTED]
 27 [REDACTED]
 28 [REDACTED]

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the reasons stated above the Court should exclude Dr. Turk's testimony.

3 DATED: March 16, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

4 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
5 & DOWD LLP
6 SHAWN A. WILLIAMS
7 JOHN H. GEORGE

8 s/ Shawn A. Williams
SHAWN A. WILLIAMS

9 Post Montgomery Center
10 One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
11 San Francisco, CA 94104
12 Telephone: 415/288-4545
13 415/288-4534 (fax)

14 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
15 & DOWD LLP
16 PAUL J. GELLER*
17 STUART A. DAVIDSON*
18 CHRISTOPHER C. GOLD*
19 120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
20 Boca Raton, FL 33432
21 Telephone: 561/750-3000
22 561/750-3364 (fax)

23 LABATON SUCHAROW LLP
24 JOEL H. BERNSTEIN*
25 CORBAN S. RHODES*
26 140 Broadway
27 New York, NY 10005
28 Telephone: 212/907-0700
212/818-0477 (fax)

EDELSON PC
JAY EDELSON*
RAFEY BALABANIAN*
350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: 312/589-6370
312/589-6378 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

* = appearance *pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 16, 2018, I authorized the electronic filing of the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I caused to be mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 16, 2018.

s/ Shawn A. Williams

SHAWN A. WILLIAMS
ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP

Post Montgomery Center
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)
E-mail: shawnw@rgrdlaw.com

3/16/2018

CAND-ECF-

Mailing Information for a Case 3:15-cv-03747-JD In re Facebook Biometric Information Privacy Litigation**Electronic Mail Notice List**

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

- **Rafey Sarkis Balabanian**
rbalabanian@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **James E Barz**
jbarz@rgrdlaw.com
- **Joel H. Bernstein**
jbernstein@labaton.com, JGardner@labaton.com, kgutierrez@labaton.com, cvillegas@labaton.com, RKamhi@labaton.com, 1375722420@filings.docketbird.com, electro
- **Stuart Andrew Davidson**
sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com, 5147990420@filings.docketbird.com, jdennis@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_sd@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_fl@rgrdlaw.com
- **Mark Dearman**
mdearman@rgrdlaw.com, 9825585420@filings.docketbird.com, e_file_sd@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_fl@rgrdlaw.com
- **Mark J. Dearman**
mdearman@rgrdlaw.com
- **Jay Edelson**
jedelson@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **Amanda M. Frame**
aframe@rgrdlaw.com
- **Paul J. Geller**
pgeller@rgrdlaw.com, jalperstein@rgrdlaw.com, swinkles@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_fl@rgrdlaw.com
- **Paul Jeffrey Geller**
pgeller@rgrdlaw.com
- **John Hamilton George**
jgeorge@rgrdlaw.com
- **Christopher Chagas Gold**
cgold@rgrdlaw.com, 4703056420@filings.docketbird.com, jdennis@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_sd@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_fl@rgrdlaw.com
- **Lauren R Goldman**
lrgoldman@mayerbrown.com, mrayfield@mayerbrown.com, jmarsala@mayerbrown.com
- **Frank S Hedin**
fhedin@hedinhall.com
- **Lily E. Hough**
lough@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **Ross M Kamhi**
rkamhi@labaton.com, kgutierrez@labaton.com, electroniccasefiling@labaton.com
- **David Philip Milian**
DMilian@CareyRodriguez.com, ejimenez@careyrodriguez.com, ecf@careyrodriguez.com
- **John Nadolenco**
jnadolenco@mayerbrown.com, rjohns@mayerbrown.com, los-docket@mayerbrown.com, jaustgen@mayerbrown.com, tstruwe@mayerbrown.com, gtmiller@mayerbrown.com
- **Alexander Nguyen**
anguyen@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **Archis A. Parasharami**
aparasharami@mayerbrown.com
- **Archis Ashok Parasharami**
aparasharami@mayerbrown.com, 4085092420@filings.docketbird.com, wdc.docket@mayerbrown.com
- **Matthew David Provance**
mprovance@mayerbrown.com, courtnotification@mayerbrown.com
- **Corban S Rhodes**
crhodes@labaton.com, kgutierrez@labaton.com, 3936743420@filings.docketbird.com, sauer@labaton.com, electroniccasefiling@labaton.com
- **Benjamin Harris Richman**
brichman@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **Frank Anthony Richter**
frichter@rgrdlaw.com

3/16/2018

CAND-ECF-

- **Alexander Glenn Tievsky**
atievsky@edelson.com, docket@edelson.com
- **Shawn A. Williams**
shawnw@rgrdlaw.com, smorris@rgrdlaw.com, ptiffith@rgrdlaw.com, dhall@rgrdlaw.com, e_file_sd@rgrdlaw.com, nlai@rgrdlaw.com

Manual Notice List

The following is the list of attorneys who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

Vincent J. Connelly
Mayer Brown LLP
71 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

Facebook Inc.
Cooley LLP
3000 El Camino Real
Five Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155